

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 20 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 3, 7, 11, 15, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18 and 20 stand rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,058,393 to Meier, et al., hereinafter referred to as "Meier".

Applicants thank the Examiner for noting the incorrect cite to the MPEP, Chapter 2100, in the response to the Office Action dated June 3, 2005. The portions of the MPEP referenced in the previous response are set out below with corrected citations.

Applicants note that a Revocation and Substitution of Power of Attorney has twice been submitted to the PTO. The Revocation was first submitted on October 24, 2004 and received by the USPTO on November 1, 2005. The Revocation was resubmitted with a copy of the return receipt postcard on January 6, 2006. The Examiner is respectfully requested to direct all future correspondence to the undersigned attorney.

Claims 3, 7, 11, 15, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the specification. First, "a second support host return address" simply defines a support host return address and not the return address of any particular support host. The claim does not recite "a second support host's return address," which apparently is how the claim was read. There is no possessive context, i.e., "'s" is not present to indicate that the address belongs to any particular support host. The dependent claims simply further define what the second support host address comprises and in fact are fully supported and described by the language in the description.

Nevertheless, to clarify the issue, Applicants have amended the independent claims to recite "a support host return address" and have amended Claims 3, 7, 11, 15, and 19 to define the set of addresses from which the support host return address can be selected.

The amendments to Claims 3, 7, 11, 15, and 19 contain no new matter and are fully supported in Applicants' specification, including, for example, pages 7 and 8, paragraph 12; and pages 15 and 16, paragraph 31. In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 112, first paragraph rejection of each of claims 3, 7, 11, 15, and 19.

Applicants have further amended Claims 1, 5, 9, 13, and 17 to more clearly recite the invention. The amendments were implicit in the original claim language when the claims were interpreted in view of the level of skill in the art and the specification as required by the MPEP. Thus, the amendments are made to move the prosecution forward and to avoid discussions on whether Applicants are requesting that limitations be read into claims from the specification.

Claims 1, 2, 4 to 6, 8 to 10, 12 to 14, 16 to 18 and 20 remain rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,058,393, referred to herein as Meier.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 1.

The MPEP requirements for an anticipation rejection are:

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. ... The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. ... The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required.

MPEP, §2131, 8th Ed., Rev. 3, p. 2100-76 (August 2005).

Applicants respectfully note that while Meier is directed to the general field of debugging, Meier teaches a fundamentally different process from that recited in Claim 1. In Meier, a process is described that permits linking a debugger to an application so that dynamic debugging can be done. In contrast, Claim 1 is directed to a process for submitting a bug report after a bug occurred. A process for establishing a dynamic debugging capability fails to teach or suggest the process of Claim 1.

In particular Meier taught:

The program requesting debugging service (i.e., a debugger client) sends, to a tool locator, criteria which specifies the properties of a desired debugger

#### Meier, Abstract

Thus, Meier taught that the criteria describing properties of a debugger were sent from a host where the program requesting debugging services was located to the tool locator. In contrast, Claim 1 recites in part:

requesting, using a Support Interface Module, a bug submission service from a first support host, said bug submission service having (i) a list of data to be collected on a host where a bug occurred and (ii) a support host return address, said first support host having a support services resource wherein said Support Interface Module is on said host where said bug occurred; and said Support Interface Module is for communicating with said first support host

Thus, the host in Claim 1 requests a bug submission service and does not send criteria for a desired debugger as in Meier. Further, the requested service has a list of data to be collected on the host where a bug occurred, which is not a list of debuggers. In Meier, the criteria specifying the properties of the desired debugger are sent prior to the occurrence of a bug. These facts alone are sufficient to distinguish over Meier.

However, Meier further taught:

When a message is received by the tool locator from a debugger client specifying the criteria of a desired debugger, the tool locator searches its registry and returns a list of debuggers matching the specified properties along with a communication endpoint address that can be used to establish a connection with a debugger meeting the criteria

Meier, Abstract

The tool locator of Meier does not return a list of data to be collected on the host as recited in Claim 1, but rather a list of debuggers. A list of debuggers fails to teach anything concerning a list of data to be collected on the host.

Finally, the action taken by the host of Meier in response to receipt of the list of debuggers is:

The debugger client then sends a message, using the established connection, to the desired debugger requesting debugging services on behalf of the debugger client or another program. As a result, a dynamic connection is made, at run time, between an application program and a debugger having certain desired properties wherein the debugger may be active, if at all, at any time on any machine within the network. (Emphasis Added.)

Meier, Abstract

Making a dynamic connection between the program and a debugger as in Meier fails to teach exactly the collecting and send operations of Claim 1. Only one of these many distinctions is needed to overcome the anticipation rejection of Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 2 and 4 depend from Claim 1 and so distinguish over Meier for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 2 and 4.

Claims 13 and 17 stand rejected for the same reasons as Claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 13 and 17. Claims 13 and 17 include limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1 and so the above remarks are directly applicable to both Claims 13 and 17 and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 13 and 17.

Claims 14 and 16 depend from Claim 13 and so distinguish over Meier for at least the same reasons as Claim 13. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of each of Claims 14 and 16.

Claims 18 and 20 depend from Claim 17 and so distinguish over Meier for at least the same reasons as Claim 17. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of each of Claims 18 and 20.

Claims 5 and 9 stand rejected for the same or similar reasons as Claims 1. Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 5 and 9. The above comments with respect to Claim 1 are also applicable to these claims and so will not be repeated and instead incorporated herein by reference. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 5 and 9.

Claims 6 and 8 depend from Claim 5 and so distinguish over Meier for at least the same reasons as Claim 5. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of each of Claims 6 and 8.

Claims 10 and 12 depend from Claim 9 and so distinguish over Meier for at least the same reasons as Claim 9. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of each of Claims 10 and 12.


Appl. No. 10/066,170

Amdt. dated February 10, 2006

Reply to Final Office Action of November 10, 2005

Claims 1 to 20 remain in the application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19 have been amended. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicants.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage for First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450, on February 10, 2006



Forrest Gunnison

2/10/06

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 32,899